

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/994,532		11/27/2001	Vy Khanh Huyhn	CM2479	8521	
27752	7590	08/25/2005		EXAMINER		
	_	GAMBLE COM	OGDEN JR, NECHOLUS			
		CHNICAL CENTER	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
6110 CEN	TER HILI	. AVENUE	1751			
CINCINN	ATI, OH	45224	DATE MAILED: 08/25/2005			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/994,532	HUYHN ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Necholus Ogden	1751				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 January 2005</u> .						
· —	action is non-final.					
,	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 20-39 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 20-39 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		·				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Do 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 09/994,532

Art Unit: 1751

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 3. Claim 20, 32, 34, 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Deleo et al (6,340,663).

Deleo et al disclose a cleaning wipe for hard surfaces such as ceramics and glass (col. 2, lines 5-12) wherein said wipe is impregnated with at least one layer of nonwoven material and comprises a surfactant (col. 3, lines 3-10). Specifically, said wipe is a nonwoven sheet of at least one material made of pulp, polyester, rayon, nylon, polypropylene, polyethylene and mixtures thereof (col. 3, lines 25-31). Deleo et al further include surfactants, thickeners, solvents and chelating agents (columns 5-10). Note, see Table II of a thickened formulation for the liquid cleanser.

Page 3

Application/Control Number: 09/994,532

Art Unit: 1751

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 7. Claims 20-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sherry et al (6,716,805).

Application/Control Number: 09/994,532

Art Unit: 1751

Sherry et al disclose a hard-surface cleansing wipe for glass and other hard surfaces wherein said wipe is made of wood pulp and synthetic materials such as polyethylene, polypropylene, polyamide and polyesters (col. 26, lines 5-20). Sherry et al teach that said substrates are thermally bonded (col. 27, lines 1-19) with thermoplastic fibers such as bicomponent fibers including sheath/core fibers having polymeric combinations (col. 28, lines 12-29). Sherry et al specifically teach that said wipe may consists of one or more layers including an optional scrub layer for (col. 28, lines 43-46) and further comprise an absorbent layer that comprises cleansing solution comprising detergents and cleansing solutions (col. 44, lines 3-23).

Sherry et al do not teach with sufficient specificity each of the claimed limitations, however, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, with reasonable expectations of success, to combine the layer(s) and the cleansing solutions of Sherry et al to produce a wipe for the purpose of cleansing dishware in the absence of a showing to the contrary, because Sherry et al teach multilayered wipe for use of glass, ceramics and other hard surface material that comprise dishware material.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Necholus Ogden whose telephone number is 571-272-1322. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yogendra N. Gupta can be reached on 571-272-1316. The fax phone

Application/Control Number: 09/994,532

Art Unit: 1751

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Necholus Ogden Primary Examiner Art Unit 1751

No 8-21-05